DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 487 HE 021 423

AUTHOR Hyman, Randy; And Others
TITLE Student Outcomes Assessment Survey 1987-88.
INSTITUTION National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (St. Louis, MO, March 27-30, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Educational Assessment; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Motivation; National Surveys; *Outcomes of Education; Performance; Quality Control; Questionnaires; Statistical Surveys; *Student Development; Student Personnel Services; Student Role; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *College Outcomes Assessment

ABSTRACT

Assessment of student learning and development has become a national issue. The status of local campus initiatives was considered in a national survey designed to determine (1) the extent to which assessment programs have been developed or are being developed, (2) the objectives and source of initiation, and (3) assessment techniques. Emphasis was on the role student affairs played in local campus assessment initiatives. All National Association of Student Personnel Administrator (NASPA) member institutions in the United States and Canada were surveyed with a pen and pencil instrument. Responses were solicited with the Total Design Survey Method. The survey form had four areas: general institutional information, student outcome program/plan, information sharing, and optional section. Institutions were identified as two- or four-year colleges, universities, or graduate schools, although there were not enough respondents in the fourth category to permit conclusions to be drawn. Findings indicate that institutions are responding to the pressure for reform by implementing outcomes assessment programs, and that this trend does not vary according to the type or size of the institution. Trends toward developing programs seem the strongest in those NASPA regions whose members are from states with statewide initiatives. Although there is a trend toward outcomes assessment, almost two-thirds of the respondents indicated no activity. Still, indications are that the program activity level will dramatically rise over the next several years. Maps, tables, the survey form, and resource listings are included. 4 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294487

NASPA DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

DUDLEY B. WOODARD, JR., Director

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF
STUDENT
PERSONNEL
ADMINISTRATORS

STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT SURVEY
1987-88

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dudley B. Woodard Jr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONDUCTED BY:
Randy Hyman, South Dakota State University
Alton Jamison, University of Arizona
Dudley B. Woodard, Jr., University of Arizona
Mark von Destinon, University of Arizona

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
Central Office/1700 18th Street, N.W.
Suite 301
Washington, D.C. 20009-2508

HE 021 423

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1987-88 NASPA Research and Program Development Committee Members

Dudley B. Woodard Jr., Chair
University of Arizona

Peter Baigent
Syracuse University

Val Christensen
Utah State University

B. Jeanne Fisher
University of Alabama-Hunstville

James Hurst
University of Wyoming

Randy Hyman
South Dakota State University

Frank Julian
Murray State University

L. Sandy MacLean
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Frances Oblander
Indiana University, Purdue University at Indianapolis

Daniel Robinson
Iowa State University

J.E. Penny Saffold
San Francisco State University

Carol Spring
University of Missouri-Kansas City

William Weitzer
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

Acknowledgement

The Research and Program Development Division would like to thank Dr. Richard Kroc and Mr. Chintamani Sahoo of the Student Affairs Research, Evaluation, and Testing Office at the University of Arizona for their assistance with this project.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction ..... Page 1
2. Method ..... Page 2
3. Discussion ..... Page 3
4. Summary ..... Page 8
5. References ..... Page 9
6. Map of NASPA Regions ..... Page 10
7. Frequency of Responses ..... Page 11
8. Tables ..... Page 16
9. Instrument ..... Page 21
10. Information Sharing ..... Page 24
11. Selected Readings on Assessment ..... Page 26

Presented at the annual conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, St. Louis, Missouri, March, 1988.

NASPA Research and Program Development Division
1987-88 Student Outcomes Assessment Survey

INTRODUCTION

The ground swell of national concern for the quality of higher education is quickly being translated into plans of action across the nation. Prompted by a series of major reports on the status of the undergraduate experience, the assessment of student learning and development has become a national issue. Ominous to some, the pressure for reform was coming from outside academe--state legislatures, governors, and accrediting bodies, as well as the general public. The result has been a scrambling to enact a series of state mandates that hold higher education accountable. Only a few years ago state mandates for assessment were rare; today two-thirds of the states have programs in place (Boyer, et. al., 1987).

Sharing the concern for quality and spurred by the implications of accountability measures, many institutions have taken advantage of the impetus provided by external bodies to design and implement assessment programs. And, most of these have attempted to place assessment in the larger context of improvement in the quality of the educational experience, rather than a singular emphasis on accountability. Some institutions have resisted outcomes assessment based on a concern for institutional autonomy and method of assessment. Many administrators, although favoring assessment, fear that responding to demands for external accountability may narrow the curriculum and compromise the quality and range of the undergraduate experience.

This national survey was conducted to determine the status of local campus initiatives. The goal was to determine: (1) if assessment programs have been developed or are being developed, (2) the objectives and source of

initiation, and (3) assessment techniques. Of particular interest was the role student affairs played in local campus assessment initiatives. Were student development outcomes included in the plan? Did student affairs participate in designing the plan? What role did student affairs play in implementation?

To our knowledge this type of study has not been done before. Surveys have been completed regarding state initiatives (Boyer, et. al., 1987), and a recent survey by the American Council on Higher Education (El-Khawas, 1987) focused on institutional assessment efforts. This study focused, however, on the role of student affairs in the development and implementation of assessment programs on campuses across the nation. The study was undertaken by the Research and Program Development Division of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

METHOD

All NASPA member institutions in the United States and Canada, a total of 1140, were surveyed using a pen and pencil instrument designed for ease of responses. The survey provided for check-off of specified responses with space for additional answers where necessary.

The Total Design Survey Method (Dillman, 1978) was used to solicit responses. This method provided for scheduled follow-up mailings after the initial request. A total of 773 responses were received before the final mailing was sent out. The data in this report are based on those responses. An additional 40 responses have been received since the fourth mailing, and though they are not included in this presentation, they will be included in the follow-up report. Additionally, there were 13 invalid responses received. The high degree of interest in this issue and the follow-up

method combined to produce a remarkable response rate of 71%. (Note: These totals will be adjusted as replies are still being received.)

The data were entered on a micro computer and organized into records of 79 columns each. Each survey required 6 records of data. The Federal Interagency Commission on Education (FICE) code number was used to identify each institution in order to distinguish between the data records. All schools authorized to award federal financial aid are assigned a six digit FICE number. Problems resulted with those few member institutions who were not so authorized. To distinguish their data records it was decided to use the zip code preceded by the letter B. For Canadian schools the six character alpha-numeric zip code was used. The data were entered into the research computer at the University of Arizona and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used for analysis.

The survey form is divided into four areas: General Institutional Information, Student Outcome Program/Plan, Information Sharing, and Optional Section. The analysis is based on the responses of the 280 institutions who checked they had or were developing an outcomes assessment program contrasted to those who indicated no action on assessment. It should be noted here that not every respondent replied to every question and that no analysis of the non respondents has been done. As with all studies relying on self reporting by the respondents, the results may be subject to variability due to interpretation.

DISCUSSION

Institutions were identified as a two year college, four year college, or university. As the responses were tallied it became necessary to include a fourth category, that of graduate school. The largest number of responses were from the four year colleges (41.6%), followed by universities (36.6%),

and then by two year colleges (20.2%). There were not enough respondents in the fourth category, graduate schools, (only 12) to permit conclusions to be drawn. Responses by source of support (public/private) were equally distributed. Institution size was divided into 7 categories ranging from 1,000 to 30,000 students and both full time equivalency (FTE) and headcount were requested. Most respondents completed either the FTE or headcount category, but not both; therefore, the headcount for those institutions who reported only FTE was taken from the Fall 1987 enrollments reported to the 1988 Higher Education Directory.

There were some interesting variations based on region and size of institution. The largest response was from Regions II, III, and IV-East and from institutions under 10,000 students. Therefore, results will reflect variations based on this clustering of responses.

The second section of the survey, titled Student Outcomes Program/Plan, asked respondents if their institution had a Student Outcomes Assessment program and, if they did not, were they in the process of developing one. The survey did not define assessment, permitting institutions to interpret it in their own way. Responses to the first and second questions were combined to provide Yes, No, and Developing categories. The majority of the respondents (63.1%) indicated that their institutions did not have, and were not developing, an assessment program. Only 16% of the respondents indicated their institutions were developing an assessment program. This is different from the survey results reported in Campus Trends 1987 where half of the institutions responding were developing assessment procedures (El-Khawas, 1987).

Respondents were requested to identify the office that initiated the outcomes assessment process, under what conditions the process was

initiated, who developed the institution's assessment program, and who is responsible for assessing outcomes at each institution. There were 224 respondents who indicated that the initiative for outcomes assessment came from either the areas of student affairs or academic affairs at their institutions. Only 46 responses indicated that statewide boards were involved in the initiation process. This may reflect the large number of private institutions responding to the survey, yet it still is surprising when compared to the results of the survey performed by the Education Commission of tha States (ECS) and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)in January-February of 1987. The ECS-AAHE survey found that two thirds of the states have outcomes assessment initiatives and "all but a few indicated they were playing important roles in assessment" (Boyer, et. al., 1987). This finding may merely indicate that student affairs and academic affairs are the areas of the institution where programs were initiated in response to the actions of statewide boards. Moreover, for those institutions who had an assessment plan, a surprising 45% of the respondents (72 institutions) indicated their assessment programs had been in operation longer than 3 years.

Accountability was listed most frequently as the condition under which the assessment process was initiated. Since the survey did not define accountability, leaving it for each respondent to interpret, the response may reflect the role of the statewide assessment initiatives. Campus committees, departments, or task forces were the answers identified most frequently as the developers of the institution's outcomes assessment programs. The campus unit responsible for assessing outcomes was evenly distributed between student and academic affairs with a strong showing by institutional research.

The involvement of student affairs in the development process appears to be quite strong with 82.6% indicating participation. The role played by student affairs seems to be largely that of a committee member (59%) and 4% indicated that outcomes assessment was the primary responsibility of the student affairs area. The possibility of a reporting bias by student affairs officers arises here, although somewhat mitigated by an analysis of the respondents. The survey was sent only to NASPA institutional members, thus student affairs officers. It is interesting to note that 160 of the returned surveys (21%) were completed by either institutional research or academic affairs offices.

The third section of the survey was titled Information Sharing and asked respondents to send copies of their assessment programs and annual reports. Those who indicated they were willing to share information on their institution's programs were asked to provide the name and address of a contact person. Last, respondents were asked if they would like to receive a copy of the survey results. An over whelming 560 respondents, 72% of the total, have so requested.

There were only 190 institutions who responded to the request for detailed information in the Optional Section. This number is greater than the number of institutions who said they had assessment plans in operation. It was interesting to review the types of data collected, when they are collected, and what comparisons are intended to be made with them. It is not surprising to see that most data were collected at entry/orientation, in the senior year, and after graduation since those traditionally have been common data collection points prior to the recent interest in assessment.

After reviewing general frequency responses, cross tabulations were performed in an attempt to see if the assessment plan varied by

institutional characteristics. A breakdown of the response to the first question, "Does your institution have an assessment plan?", by NASPA Region is provided in Table 1. Two regions stand out as having the largest number of assessment plans in operation. They are Region II, composed of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, and Region III, composed of the southern states.

A further breakdown of the response by region is provided in Table 2 where those institutions developing programs are separated out of the no answers. Again we see that Regions II and III show activity, yet Region IV-West, primarily the plains states, and Region V, the northwest, have begun to develop programs as well. Analysis of the activity in the regions can be related to developments in the states. The impact of the guidelines adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), a regional accrediting agency, can be seen in Region III. In addition, five of the states in that region have addressed assessment on a statewide level. The states in a region who either have, or are undertaking, statewide assessment initiatives may be noted as a possible causal factor in the activity seen in Table 2.

Having examined the response by region, the institution's classification was next compared to the assessment plan to determine if the existence or development of assessment plans varied by type of institution. This comparison can be seen in Table 3 where no major differences are noted. The existence of assessment plans and the activity towards developing plans is shown to be remarkably similar across all types of institutions.

Table 4 examines the distribution of responses between the Public and Private institutions. The public institutions have only a slight lead over private institutions with established plans. The two types of institutions

are almost evenly balanced in not having plans. It is in the developing plans area that a difference appears with 61.1% of the public institutions showing action. This, again, possibly reflects the influence of statewide intiatives on public institutions.

The last cross tabulation, Table 5, presents institution size, based on the fall 1987 headcount, compared to the existence of an assessment plan. Minimal differences were noted among the groups except for institutions from 5,000-9,999 students and those over 30,000 students. Those two categories show more activity in the area of developing plans than do institutions of other sizes, however the difference is not large. The small number of respondents from institutions over 30,000 makes interpretation difficult.

SUMMARY

In general, institutions are responding to the pressure for reform by implementing outcomes assessment programs. This trend does not vary by type or size of institution, and the differences between public and private institutions are minimal. It is in the category of developing plans that the largest difference is seen; nearly two-thirds of those institutions who are developing programs are public.

The trend towards developing programs appears the strongest in those regions of NASPA whose members are from states with statewide initiatives. In spite of this trend towards outcomes assessment, it must be noted that nearly two-thirds of the respondents reported no activity. However, if the response to the ECS-AAHE and Campus Trends reports and the activity noted in this report are accurate, the interest and program activity level will dramatically increase over the next few years. The Research and Program Development Division will continue to monitor this trend and report findings to the membership.

REFERENCES

Boyer, C., Ewell, P, Findley, J. and Mingle, J. "Assessment and Outcomes Measurement: A View from the States." AAHE Bulletin, 39 no. 7, 1987 (8-12).

Dillman, D. Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1978.

El-Khawas, E. "Colleges Reclaim the Assessment Initiative," Educational Record. Spring, 1987, 54-58.

Torregrosa, C. (Ed.) Higher Education Directory. Washington: Higher Education Publications, Inc., 1988.

REGION MAP

From: NASPA 1987 Membership Directory

NASPA Research and Program Development Division
1987-88 Student Outcomes Assessment Survey Frequency of Responses

Section I. General Institutional Information

1. Response by Region of NASPA

Region 1	76	(10.%)
Region 2	145	(19.1%)
Region 3	162	(21.3%)
Region 4-East	157	(20.7%)
Region 4-West	99	(13.%)
Region 5	61	(8.%)
Region 6	60	(7.9%)
Total	760	

2. Response by Classification of Institution

2 Year College	154	(20.2%)
4 Year College	316	(41.6%)
University	278	(36.6%)
Graduate School	12	(1.6%)
	760	

3. Response by source of support

Public Institution	405	(53.3%)
Private Institution	355	(46.7%)
	760	

4. Responses by Size of Institution

Headcount		
under 1,000	125	(16.4%)
1,000-2,499	215	(28.3%)
2,500-4,999	138	(18.2%)
5,000-9,999	124	(16.3%)
10,000-19,999	91	(12.%)
20,000-30,000	41	(5.4%)
over 30,000	26	(3.4%)
	760	

Section II. Student Outcome Program/Plan

1. Does your institution have a student outcomes assessment program?

Yes- 154	No- 479	Developing- 126
20.3%	63.1%	16.6%

(Percentages based on actual responses)

2. How long has your assessment plan been in operation?

1 Year	34 (26%)
2 Years	22 (16.8%)
3 Years	16 (12.2%)
Over 3 Years	59 (45%)

No Response 629

(Percentages based on actual responses)

3. Who initiated the outcomes assessment process at your institution?

Trustees/Board	23
Academic Affairs	114
Legislature	29
Students	5
President	72
Student Affairs	104
Faculty	30
Business Affairs	2
Statewide Board	46
Regional Accreditation	8
Governor	2
Campus Committee	3
Other	8

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

4. Under what conditions was the assessment process initiated?

Financial Exigency	6
Curricular Reform	57
Accountability	155
Academic Reorganize	28
Regional Accreditation	18
Retention	4
General Interest	4
Statewide Board	3
Planning	3
Grant	2
Other	8

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

5. Who developed your institution's outcomes assessment program?

Campus Committee	77
Campus Task Force	74
Campus Department	58
Consultant	14
Statewide Board	8
Alumni	2
External Body	2

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

6. Who is responsible for assessing student outcomes on your campus?

Institutional Research	106
Student Affairs	139
Academic Affairs	138
University Wide Comm.	37
College/Departments	65
Statewide Board	2
Alumni	2
Other	6

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

7. Was Student Affairs involved in the development process?
Yes- 199 (82.6%) No- 42 (17.4%) No Response- 519

8. In what way was Student Affairs involved?

Advisory Capacity	68	(33%)
Committee Member	120	(59%)
Primary Responsibility	8	(4%)
Other	7	(4%)

9. Is there a Committee or Office responsible for coordinating your institution's outcomes assessment program?
Yes- 155 (64.9%) No- 84 (35.1%) No Response- 521

Section III. Information Sharing

Will you send a copy of your outcomes assessment implementation plan?
Yes- 51 No- 13 Not Available- 291 No Response- 405

Will you send a copy of your most recent annual outcomes assessment report?
Yes- 27 No-23 Not Available- 271 No Response- 439

Follow-up is taking place requesting those materials.
A list of institutions willing to share information is provided.

Optional Section

There were 190 schools who responded on the optional section. Time did not permit institutional analysis, however a frequency count of the responses is provided.

1. Does your plan assess:

General Education Outcomes	95
Major/Specialization Outcomes	73
Student Development Outcomes	73

2. What measures are used in your program?
(Respondents were asked to check more than one).

ACT	53
SAT	37
ACT COMP	38
GRE	28
CIRP	28
CSEQ	12
Student Project/Portfolio	25
Student Documents/Records	49
Entering Student Survey	47
Employer Survey	32
Continuing Student Survey	48
Alumni Survey	68
Withdrawing Student Survey	59
Student Observation	20
Student Interviews	43
Statewide Exam	3
Institutional Exam	7
ETS	5
Other	18

3. Which of the methods/measures are used to collect pre and post data?
(Respondents were asked to check more than one).

ACT	36
SAT	21
ACT COMP	30
GRE	9
CIRP	15
CSEQ	4
Student Project/Portfolio	7
Student Documents/Records	24
Entering Student Survey	26
Employer Survey	16
Continuing Student Survey	24
Alumni Survey	31
Withdrawing Student Survey	26
Student Observation	8
Student Interviews	22
Institutional Exam	2
Other	11

4. At what points are the data collected?
(Respondents were asked to check more than one).

Entry/Orientation	86
Freshman Year	59
Sophomore Year	53
Junior Year	39
Senior Year	64
At Graduation	41
After Graduation	65

5. What kinds of comparisons are expected with the data?
(Respondents were asked to check more than one).

Institution Only	87
Peer Institutions	42
Statewide Comparisons	29
National Comparisons	42
Other	2

Table 1

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan by Region of NASPA

PLAN	REGION Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV-East	Region IV-West	Region V	Region VI	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	9	40	46	22	22	4	11	154
	r=5.8	r=26.	r=29.9	r=14.3	r=14.3	r=2.6	r=7.1	r=20.5
	c=12.2	c=27.8	c=28.8	c=14.1	c=22.2	c=6.7	c=18.6	
No Plan	65	104	114	134	77	56	48	598
	r=10.9	r=17.4	r=19.1	r=22.4	r=12.9	r=9.4	r=8.0	r=79.5
	c=87.8	c=72.2	c=71.2	c=85.9	c=77.8	c=93.3	c=81.4	
COLUMN TOTAL	74	144	160	156	99	60	59	752
	9.8	19.1	21.3	20.7	13.2	8.0	7.8	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 8)

Region II and Region III show the largest number of assessment plans in operation.

Table 2

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan by Region of NASPA

PLAN	REGION Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV-East	Region IV-West	Region V	Region VI	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	9	40	46	22	22	4	11	154
	r=5.8	r=26.	r=29.9	r=14.3	r=14.3	r=2.6	r=7.1	r=20.8
	c=12.5	c=28.4	c=29.1	c=14.3	c=22.2	c=6.8	c=19.	
No Plan	59	72	79	113	54	42	41	460
	r=12.8	r=15.7	r=17.2	r=24.6	r=11.7	r=9.1	r=8.9	r=62.2
	c=81.9	c=51.1	c=50	c=73.9	c=54.6	c=71.2	c=70.7	
Developing Plan	4	29	33	18	23	13	6	126
	r=3.2	r=23.	r=26.2	r=14.3	r=18.3	r=10.3	r=4.8	r=17.
	c=5.6	c=20.5	c=20.9	c=11.8	c=23.2	c=22.	c=10.3	
COLUMN TOTAL	72	141	158	153	99	59	58	740
	9.7	19.1	21.4	20.7	13.4	8.0	7.8	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 20)

Developing Plan totals reduce the number of No Plan responses.
Region II and Region III show the most number of assessment plans in operation.
Regions II, III, IV-West, and V show activity towards developing assessment programs.

Table 3

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan By Classification

PLAN	CLASSIFICATION: 2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Graduate School	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	30	66	55	3	154
	r=19.5	r=42.9	r=35.7	r=1.9	r=20.8
	c=19.7	c=21.5	c=20.4	c=27.	
No Plan	95	189	168	8	460
	r=20.7	r=41.1	r=36.5	r=1.7	r=62.2
	c=62.5	c=62.	c=61.9	c=72	
Developing Plan	27	51	48		126
	r=21.4	r=40.5	r=38.1		r=17
	c=17.8	c=16.5	c=17.7		
COLUMN TOTAL	152	306	271	11	740
	20.5	41.4	36.6	1.5	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 20)

Assessment activities similar across all types of institutions.

Table 4

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan By Source of Support

PLAN	SOURCE OF SUPPORT: Public Institution	SOURCE OF SUPPORT: Private Institution	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	87	67	154
	r=56.5	r=43.5	r=20.8
	c=21.9	c=19.5	
No Plan	234	226	460
	r=50.9	r=49.1	r=62.2
	c=58.8	c=66.	
Developing Plan	77	49	126
	r=61.1	r=38.9	r=17
	c=19.3	c=14.3	
COLUMN TOTAL	398	342	740
	53.6	46.2	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 20)

Public institutions show more activity developing plans than private.

Table 5

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan by Institution Size (Fall 1987 Headcount)

PLAN	SIZE: Under 1,000	1,000-2,499	2,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-30,000	Over 30,000	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	21	44	27	29	18	8	6	153
	r=13.7	r=28.8	r=17.6	r=19.	r=11.8	r=5.2	r=3.9	r=20.7
	c=17.6	c=20.9	c=20.6	c=23.6	c=20.	c=20.	c=24.	
No Plan	81	132	84	64	60	25	13	459
	r=17.6	r=28.8	r=18.3	r=13.9	r=13.1	r=5.4	r=2.8	r=62.2
	c=68.1	c=62.9	c=64.1	c=52.	c=66.7	c=62.5	c=52.	
Developing Plan	17	34	20	30	12	7	6	126
	r=13.5	r=27.	r=15.9	r=23.8	r=9.5	r=5.6	r=4.8	r=17.1
	c=14.3	c=16.2	c=15.3	c=24.4	c=13.3	c=17.5	c=24.	
COLUMN TOTAL	119	210	131	123	90	40	25	738
	16.1	28.5	17.8	16.7	12.2	5.4	3.4	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 22)

No differences by institution size except in developing plan for 5,000-9,999 and Over 30,000.

I. General Institutional Information

1. Name of Respondent: _____
   Title: _____
   Address: _____
   Telephone Number: _____
2. NASPA Region: I ____ II ____ III ____ IV-East ____ IV-West ____
   V ____ VI ____
3. Classification: 2-year College ____ 4-year College ____ University ____
4. Source of Support: Public ____ Private ____
5. Size of Institution: Total Enrollment Fall 1987:

FTE Count		Headcount Full & Part Time	
Under 1,000	____	Under 1,000	____
1,000-2,499	____	1,000-2,499	____
2,500-4,999	____	2,500-4,999	____
5,000-9,999	____	5,000-9,999	____
10,000-19,999	____	10,000-19,999	____
20,000-30,000	____	20,000-30,000	____
Over 30,000	____	Over 30,000	____

II. Student Outcome Program/Plan

1. Does your institution have a student outcomes assessment program?
   Yes __ No __
2. If NO, has a student outcomes assessment plan been developed for your institution ? Yes __ No __
3. If YES to Question 2, what is the anticipated implementation date?
   _____
4. If a plan is already in operation, how long has it been in use?
   1 year __ 2 years __ 3 years __ Longer __
5. Who initiated the outcomes assessment process? (may check more than one)
   Trustees/Board __ Academic Affairs __ Legislature __ Students __
   President __ Student Affairs __ Faculty __ Business Affairs __
   Statewide Board __ Other (Please Specify) _____
6. Under what conditions was the process initiated?
   Financial Exigency __ Curricular Reform __ Accountability __
   Academic Reorganization __ Other (please specify) _____

7. Who developed your institution's outcomes assessment program?
   Campus Committee __ Campus Task Force __ Campus Agency/Department __
   Consultant __ External Body (please define) _____
8. Who is responsible for assessing student outcomes on your campus?
   (check all that apply) Institutional Research __ Student Affairs __
   Academic Affairs __ University Wide Committee __ College/Departments __
   Other (please specify) _____
9. Was Student Affairs involved in the development process? Yes __ No __
10. If YES to Question 9, in what way? Advisory Capacity __
    Committee/Task Force Member __ Other (please specify) _____
11. Is there a committee or office responsible for coordinating your institution's outcomes assessment program/plan? Yes __ No __
12. If yes, please identify the chair or coordinator (name,address,phone)

_____

_____

_____

III. Information Sharing

1. Will you send us a copy of your outcomes assessment implementation plan? Yes __ No __ Not Available __
2. Will you send us a copy of your most recent annual outcomes assessment report? Yes __ No __ Not Available __
3. If several institutions share their implementation plans and annual reports a brief summary will be presented at the annual conference in St. Louis next spring. If you would like your institution to be listed on a reference handout at the conference please indicate. Yes __ No __
4. If YES, who should be listed as the contact person? (name,address,phone)

_____

_____

_____

5. Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results? Yes __ No __

Please return surveys and address all inquiries to:
NASPA Research & Program Development Division
Administration Building, Room 401
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0664
(602) 621-3772

OPTIONAL SECTION: Program Specific

We would appreciate your completing this optional section, but not at the expense of a timely response to the survey

1. Does your plan assess: (may check more than one)
   General Education Outcomes ___
   Major/Specialization Outcomes ___
   Student Development Outcomes ___

2. What measures are used in your program? (may check more than one)
   ACT __ SAT __ ACT COMP __ GRE __ CIRP __ CSEQ __
   Student Projects/Portfolios __ Student Documents/Records __
   Locally Developed Entering Student Survey __ Employer Survey __
   Locally Developed Continuing Student Survey __ Alumni Survey __
   Withdrawing Student Survey __ Student Observation __
   Student Interviews __ Other: (please specify)
   _____
   _____

3. Which of the methods/measures are used to collect pre and post test data? (may check more than one)
   ACT __ SAT __ ACT COMP __ GRE __ CIRP __ CSEQ __
   Student Projects/Portfolios __ Student Documents/Records __
   Locally Developed Entering Student Survey __ Employer Survey __
   Locally Developed Continuing Student Survey __ Alumni Survey __
   Withdrawing Student Survey __ Student Observation __
   Student Interviews __ Other: (please specify)
   _____
   _____

4. At what points are the data collected? (may check more than one)
   Entry/Orientation __ Freshman Year __ Sophomore Year __ Junior Year __
   Senior Year __ At Graduation __ Following Graduation __

5. What kinds of comparisons are expected with the data?
   Institution Only __ Peer Institutions __ Statewide Comparisons __
   National Comparisons __ Other (please specify) _____

INSTITUTIONS WILLING TO SHARE INFORMATION
ON THEIR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

C. Pettigrem
V. P. Student Services
Tuskegee University
Tuskegee, AL 36088

Betty Asher
V. P. Student Affairs
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

Doug Woodard
V. P. Student Affairs
University of Arizona
Admin. Bldg. - 401
Tucson, AZ 85721-0664
(602) 621-3772

Kristine Dillon
Asst. V. P.
Univ. Southern CA
STU 201
Los Angeles, CA 90089

Frank Gornick
Dean of Students
Bakersfield College
1801 Oanorama Dr.
Bakersfield, CA 93305

Colorado State Univ.
Fort Collins, CO 80523
(303) 491-5693

Arlene Virgil
Vice President
Front Range Comm.
Westminster, CO 80030
(303) 466-8811

Diane Unger
Adm. Officer
S. E. Col. Osteopath
1750 N.E. 168 St.
N. Miami Beach, FL 33162

George W. Young
V. P. Student Affairs
Broward Comm. Col.
225 E. Los Olas Blvd.
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301

William Thomas
V. C. Student Affairs
UofMD College Park
2108 N. Admin. Bldg.
College Park, MD 20742

Bernard Brown
V. P. Student Affairs
Worcester Institute
100 Institute Road
Worcester, MA 01609

Van D. Quick
V. P. Student Personnl
Mississippi College
P. O. Box #4007
Clinton, MS 39056

Thomas R. Lease
V. P. Student Affairs
Avila College
11901 Wornall Road
Kansas City, MO 64145

Sandy McLean
V. C. Student Affairs
Univ. MS - St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121

Asst. V. C. Students
Univ NE-Omaha
Omaha, NE 68182

David Elderkin
Hesser College
25 Lowell St.
Manchester, NH 03101

Janice Murray
Dean of Students
Kean College
Morris Avenue
Union, NJ 07083
(201) 527-2190

Wynn Phillips
Dean, Student Affairs
Union County College
Crawford, NJ 07016

Thomas Eakin
Penn State University
211 Eisenhower
McKeesport, PA 15132
(814) 863-4926

David Scarborough
Dean of Students
Washington Jefferson
Washington, PA 15301

Thomas R. Dougan
Asst. V. P. Campus Life
University Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881

Karen Haskell
Dean of Students
Roger William College
Bristol, RI 02809

Bud Donohue
V. P. Student Life
Univ. South Dakota
Vermillion, SD 57069

Dean Student Affairs
Dakota State College
Madison, SD 57042

Kris Smith
South Dakota St. U.
Admin. 315
Brookings, SD 57007
(605) 688-4493

Donald Carson
V. P. Student Services
Memphis State Univ.
Memphis, TN 38152

D. Grandberry
Tenn. State University
Nashville, Tenn. 37203

Tom Walter
Director, Cnslg
Reinhardt College
Waleska, GA 30183

William Daehling
Vice President
Lewis Clark St. Col.
Lewiston, ID 83501

Josep Palladino
Univ. Southern IN
8600 Univ. Blvd.
Evansville, IN 47712

Dr. Jack Sanders
Indiana St. Univ.
Student Services A4
217 N. 6th Street
Terre Haute, IN 47809
(812) 237-3845

Daryl Hersemann
Valparaiso Univ.
Valparaiso, IN 36383

Jeannette Lester
St. Mary's College
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Dr. Gerald Jorgensen
V. P. Student Dev.
Loras College
Dubuque, IA 52001

Mervin Buzzard
Haskell Indian Jr.
23rd Baker Ave.
Lawrence, KS 66046

Dan P. Vandewinkle
Dean of Students
Ft. Scott Comm. Col.
2108 South Horton
Ft. Scott, KS 66701

Craig A. Clagett
Prince George's Com.
Largo, MD 20772

Tina Taylor
Santa Fe Comm.
P. O. Box 4187
Santa Fe, NM 87502

Wayne Gares
V. P. Student Affairs
Eastern NM Univ.
Portales, NM 88130

Michael Cooper
Dean of Students
Clarkston Univ.
Potsdam, NY 13676
(315) 268-6620

Robert Goldschmidt
Dean
Touro College
30 W. 44 Street
New York, NY 10036
(212) 221-2296

Nancy Thompson
SUNY A&T Farmingdale
Farmingdale, NY 11735
(516) 589-7389

James Lancaster
Dean of Students
Univ. NC Greensboro
155 Ellion Ctr.
Greensboro, NC 27412

Michael Riemann
V. P. Academic Affairs
Pfeifer College
Misenheimer, NC 28109

Meg Benne
Asst. Dean of Students
Ohio Univ. Athens
212 Culver
Athens, OH 45701

James Bowser
V. P. Student Services
Hocking Tech. Col.
Rt. #1
Nelsonville, OH 45764

George Dupey
Tiffin University
155 Miami Street
Tiffin, OH 44883

Anthony Deconcilius
V. P. Student Affairs
King's College
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18711
(717) 826-5878

Howard Benoist
Our Lady of the Lake Univ.
San Antonio, TX 78285

Dr. Gerard Dizinno
Dir., Outcomes Assessment
St. Mary's University
San Antonio, TX 78284

Dr. Mary Hill
Dean of Students
West TX State Univ.
Canyon, TX 79016
(806) 656-2049

Steven Culver
Radford University
Radford, VA 24141
(703) 831-5819

L. Low
Univ. of Virginia
Cinch Valley Wise, VA
24293
(703) 328-0183

William Moore
Student Dev. Ed.
Longwood College
Farmville, VA 23901
(804) 392-9261

R. Wilson
V. P. Student Affairs
VA Commonworth Univ.
Richard, VA 23284

Dr. Grant Smith
V. P. Undergrad Pg.
Eastern WA Univ.
Academic Affairs #132
Cheney, WA 99004

Patricia Woehrlin
Asst. V. P. Student Affairs
Univ. Washington
472 Schmitz Hall
Seattle, WA 98195

SELECTED READINGS ON ASSESSMENT

Adelman, C. (Ed.) Assessment in American Higher Education: Issues and Contexts. Office of Educational research and Improvement, U.S. Dept. of Education, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Alveno College Faculty. Assessment at Alverno. Milwaukee, Wisc.: Alverno College Productions, 1979.

Astin, A. "Why Not Try Some New Ways of Measuring Qulaity?" Educational Record 1982, 63, 10-15.

Boyer, C., Ewell, P., Finley, J. and Mingle, J. "Assessment and Outcomes Measurement: A View from the States," AAHE Bulletin, 39, no. 7, 1987 (8-12).

El-Khawas, E. Campus Trends, 1987. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1987.

Ewell, P. (Ed.) Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Ewell, P. Information on Student Outcomes: How to Get It and How to Use It. Boulder, CO.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1983.

Halpern, D. Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987

Kuh, G. Indices of Quality in the Undergraduate Experience. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no.4. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1981.

Marchese, Ted. "Learning about Assessment." AAHE Bulletin, September, 1986, 38, no. 1, (10-13).